REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The specification and claims have been carefully reviewed in the light of the Office Action to which this amendment is responsive. By this amendment, claims 15 and 16, which have been indicated as being directed to allowable subject matter, have been rewritten in independent form as new claims 21 and 22, respectively. The sole remaining claim has been amended to improve its form and to distinguish even more clearly over the prior art.

Claim 12 has been rejected as being obvious over Lemetyinen et al. (US 5,664,731) in view of Kettlety et al. (US 4,867,870) and Wick (US 5,746,250), and reconsideration of such rejection is respectfully requested in the light of the foregoing amendments. As brought out in the prior prosecution, applicant's invention is directed to a comprehensive spraying system comprising a plurality of spray headers which each have a cleaning brush and a selectively movable drain control valve for enabling efficient cleaning of the spray nozzles inlet orifices of the spray device. A control system for the spray header is provided which includes a microprocessor based control circuit for each spray header motor that is programmed to rotate the brush a pre-determined number of turns in one rotary direction in response to a first control signal for cleaning the inlet apertures to each spray nozzle and simultaneously moving the control valve to a drain opening position as an incident to rotation of the brush to allow liquid and removed debris to discharge through the drain opening and to rotate the brush in a pre-determined number of turns in an opposite rotary direction in response to a second control signal to effect further cleaning and the simultaneous return movement of the control valve to a position closing the drain opening as an incident to rotation of the brush in the opposite direction.

In contrast, the prior art is devoid of any teaching of a spray header type spraying system with a control system as claimed. Lemetyinen, as the Examiner acknowledges, includes no controller or even a motor for rotating the cleaning brush shaft. Kettlety only discloses a motor that is controlled to rotate a brush and a separate independently controlled solenoid operated drain valve. It does not disclose a control that is programmed for rotating the brush a pre-determined number of turns in one direction for simultaneously cleaning the nozzle inlets and opening a drain control valve as an incident to brush rotation and for rotating the brush a pre-determined number of turns in an opposite rotary direction to effect further cleaning and simultaneous return of the valve to a position closing the drain opening as an incident to rotation of the brush in the opposite direction. Following Kettlety brush

rotation and valve operation would be separately controlled. Wick only relates to controlling operation of a plurality of motors, and like Kettlety, is silent as to any control which would operate the cleaning brushes and control valves of a plurality of spray headers as set forth in claim 12. It is, of course, the prior art which must teach the claimed invention, not picking and choosing of individual elements of the prior art that might be designed, with hindsight, to provide the inventive automatically controlled liquid spraying system.

Hence, it is believed that claim 12 as now presented is directed to features which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art so as to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, an early action to that affect is respectfully requested.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at his direct number (312) 616-5640.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis R. Schlemmer, Reg. No. 24,703 LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.

Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900

180 North Stetson Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780

(312) 616-5600 (telephone) (312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: May 23, 2006

m:\doc\pat\drs\225518\225518-resp oa after rce.doc